UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/528,449	03/18/2005	Kiyoto Horimoto	SIG-009	4274

32628   7590   01/15/2009

KANESAKA BERNER AND PARTNERS LLP
1700 DIAGONAL RD
SUITE 310
ALEXANDRIA, VA 22314-2848

EXAMINER
SITTNER, MATTHEW T

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
3629	

MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE
01/15/2009	PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

	Application No.	Applicant(s)
Office Action Summary	10/528,449	HORIMOTO, KIYOTO
	Examiner	Art Unit
	MATTHEW SITTNER	3629

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE *3* MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on *18 March 2005*.

2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**.   2b) ☒ This action is non-final.

3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

4) ☒ Claim(s) *1-15* is/are pending in the application.

　　4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.

5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.

6) ☒ Claim(s) *1-15* is/are rejected.

7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.

8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.

10) ☒ The drawing(s) filed on *18 March 2005* is/are: a) ☒ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.

　　Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).

　　Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).

11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

12) ☒ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).

　　a) ☒ All   b) ☐ Some *   c) ☐ None of:

　　　　1. ☒ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.

　　　　2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.

　　　　3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

　　* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
3) ☒ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08)
　　Paper No(s)/Mail Date *03/18/2005*.

4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)
　　Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ .
5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application
6) ☐ Other: _____ .

DETAILED ACTION

Status of Claims

1.   This action is in reply to the application filed on 03/18/2005. Claims 1-15 are currently

pending and have been examined.

Information Disclosure Statement

2.   The information disclosure statement submitted on 03/18/2005, has been considered by

the Examiner and made of record in the application file.

Preliminary Amendment

3.   The present Office Action is based upon the original patent application filed on

03/18/2005 as modified by the preliminary amendment filed on 03/18/2005. Claims 1-15 are

now pending in the present application.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112

4.   The following is a quotation of the first paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

> The specification shall contain a written description of the invention, and of the manner and process of making
> and using it, in such full, clear, concise, and exact terms as to enable any person skilled in the art to which it
> pertains, or with which it is most nearly connected, to make and use the same and shall set forth the best mode
> contemplated by the inventor of carrying out his invention.

5.   Claims 5, 8-11, 14-15 rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, first paragraph, as failing to comply

with the enablement requirement. The claim(s) contains subject matter which was not described

in the specification in such a way as to enable one skilled in the art to which it pertains, or with

which it is most nearly connected, to make and/or use the invention.

6.   Regarding Claim 5,

5. The estate group purchasing matching system according to claim 1, wherein the estate

purchase desirer general extraction means extracts general information of a plurality of estate

purchase desirers using the search condition setting means, and is capable of simulating possible

combination patterns.

The applicant does not enable one of ordinary skill to simulate possible combination

patterns. Applicant does provide an enabling disclosure as to what applicant means by

simulate or simulating. Applicant does not provide an enabling disclosure as to how he

proposes to simulate combination patterns.

7.   Regarding Claims 5, 8-11, 14-15:

Applicant claims "combination patterns" and "pattern selection reference".

However, "pattern" is not enabled. Examiner believes that the term 'pattern' or 'parcel

pattern' may not have been properly translated from the original disclosure. Applicant is

asked to further define what is meant by pattern. The disclosure at [0028, 0084, 0085,

0086, 0091-0095, 0099, 0102-0104, 0107-0113] mentions 'parcel pattern'. However, parcel

pattern is not a term normally associated with this art in the United States.

Where applicant acts as his or her own lexicographer to specifically define a term of

a claim contrary to its ordinary meaning, the written description must clearly redefine the

claim term and set forth the uncommon definition so as to put one reasonably skilled in the

art on notice that the applicant intended to so redefine that claim term. *Process Control*

*Corp. v. HydReclaim Corp.***, 190 F.3d 1350, 1357, 52 USPQ2d 1029, 1033 (Fed. Cir. 1999).**

The way in which the term "pattern" is used in claims 5, 8-11, 14-15 is not understood. The

term is indefinite because the specification does not clearly define or redefine the term.

8.   Regarding Claim 14,

        14. The estate group purchasing matching system according to claim 8, wherein a

property line of parcels of the offered property is changed based on the pattern selection

reference information and the customer information.

        Applicant claims changing the property line of parcels. However, applicant does not

enable one of ordinary skill in the art how to perform that which is claimed. Applicant

discloses property line at [0033, 0104] but doesn't disclose how this is performed. Is

applicant using a prior art Computer Aided Drafting (CAD) system to make changes to a

property line? Or is applicant using some other system to make changes to the claimed

property line?

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112

9.   The following is a quotation of the second paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

        The specification shall conclude with one or more claims particularly pointing out and distinctly claiming the
        subject matter which the applicant regards as his invention.

10.   Claims 6-7 rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing

to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the

invention.

11.   Regarding Claims 6-7,

6. The estate group purchasing matching system according to claim 1, further comprising:

desired condition analysis means for analyzing in detail the conditions of each of the plurality of

estate purchase general candidates extracted by the estate purchase desirer general extraction

means with respect to each property of the for-sale property information database to narrow

combinations.

7. The estate group purchasing matching system according to claim 6, wherein with

respect to each property of the for-sale property information database, the property processing

means processes the property so that a designated candidate for-sale property is allocated to

match as much as possible with needs of a plurality of estate purchase candidates selected by the

desired condition analysis means.

The claims are generally narrative and indefinite, failing to conform with current

U.S. practice. They appear to be a literal translation into English from a foreign document

and are replete with grammatical and idiomatic errors.

Both claims 6 and 7 should be rewritten to clearly convey what applicant is

claiming.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

12.   The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the

basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

> (a) the invention was known or used by others in this country, or patented or described in a printed publication in this
> or a foreign country, before the invention thereof by the applicant for a patent.
>
> **(b) the invention was patented or described in a printed publication in this or a foreign country or in public use
> or on sale in this country, more than one year prior to the date of application for patent in the United States.**
>
> (e) the invention was described in-
> (1) an application for patent, published under section 122(b), by another filed in the United States before the
> invention by the applicant for patent; or (2) a patent granted on an application for patent by another filed in the
> United States before the invention by the applicant for patent, *except* that an international application filed under
> the treaty defined in section 351(a) shall have the effects for the purposes of this subsection of an application
> filed in the United States only if the international application designated the United States and was published
> under Article 21(2) of such treaty in the English.

13.   Claims 1-2, 4-8 rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by: Janssen, US

5,754,850 (Janssen).

14.   Regarding Claim 1, "Janssen" discloses the following as claimed:

1. An estate group purchasing matching system comprising:

Janssen discloses a computer system which matches real estate buyers with sellers.

Janssen at Abstract and at Summary of the Invention.

property data storage means **(Fig. 2. CPU 250, Hard disk 210, Floppy Disk 220, CD**

ROMS 230; all of these are storage means which may store property data) for generating a

database of for-sale property information provided from estate sales desirers, estate purchase

brokers and others, on a network where the estate sales desirers and the estate purchase brokers

are connected to enable data communications there between **(Fig. 2. Modem 270 – is used to communicate over a network)**;

Janssen discloses a property database where buyers, brokers and sellers all visit to advertise and shop for real estate. See Fig. 2, and at col. 2, lines 10-21, 33-45; col. 3, lines 40-60; col. 4, lines 1-31; col. 8, lines 28-48.

Janssen further discloses using modems to facilitate communications and to update the databases. Janssen at col. 2, lines 10-20; col. 4, lines 1-12.

estate purchase desirer data input means for generating a database of information of desired purchase conditions of estate purchase desirers and attribute information on the estate purchase desirers input from a plurality of terminal apparatuses, on a network where the estate purchase desirers and the estate purchase brokers are connected to enable data communications there between;

Buyer is construed as claimed estate purchase desirer. Fig. 1 discloses a touch monitor 120. Inputs from a user (i.e. a buyer or estate purchase desirer) are received by touch monitor. Janssen at col. 3, lines 59-67.

At Fig. 3 a buyer may generate a database of information of desired purchase conditions and attribute information which reflects his desires concerning a property. For example, the buyer may enter a maximum property price – Fig. 3. Or the buyer may enter the minimum number of bedrooms – Fig. 4. See also, Janssen at col. 4, lines 32-67.

search condition setting means for analyzing the desired purchase conditions of the estate

purchase desirers and the attribute information on the estate purchase desirers on each property

of the for-sale property information database in the property data storage means, and setting a

search condition corresponding to the each property from the estate purchase desirer information

database generated by the estate purchase desirer data input means;

Figs. 5, 6a, and 6b disclose the search method/strategy used by the Janssen

invention. See also Janssen at cols. 5-6.

estate purchase desirer general extraction means for searching general information of a

plurality of estate purchase desirer candidates based on the search condition set by the search

condition setting means, and extracting a plurality of estate purchase general candidates;

The logic or search method as disclosed in Figs. 5 and 6 and cols. 5-6 is construed as

applicant's claimed general extraction means. The search method disclosed by Janssen

returns search results which match or nearly match the criteria entered by the user/buyer.

Janssen at col. 2, lines 50-58. These search results are construed as claimed plurality of

estate purchase general candidates.

desired condition analysis means for analyzing desired purchase conditions of the

plurality of estate purchase general candidates extracted by the estate purchase desirer general

extraction means corresponding to the each property of the, for-sale property information

database, and setting combinations thereof; and property processing means for processing the

property to enable matching with desires of the plurality of estate purchase general candidates.

**Janssen discloses a sophisticated method of sorting through the vast property
database to sift out a reasonable number exact or near exact property matches meeting
buyer's criteria. This method is disclosed at Figs. 7a and 7b and at cols. 6-8, and at Table
A.**

15.   Regarding Claim 2, "Janssen" discloses the following as claimed:

2. The estate group purchasing matching system according to claim 1, wherein the for-
sale property information databased by the property data storage means includes at least a
database storing attribution data such as an application, a type, location information, owner
information, information of price per unit area and environment information of each property,
and a map database with which is registered data of maps on which properties are present.

**At Figs. 7a and 7b; Tables A and B; cols. 6-8; Janssen discloses a database which
stores a plurality of information/data on every for-sale property stored in the database.
This data is construed as claimed attribution data and includes at least the following:
amenities, price, location, bedrooms, zip code, size, square footage, etc...**

16.   Regarding Claim 4, "Janssen" discloses the following as claimed:

4. The estate group purchasing matching system according to claim 1, wherein the search
condition setting means analyzes the desired purchase conditions of the estate purchase desirers
and the attribute information of the purchase desirers on each property of the for-sale property

using the estate purchase desirer information database, and extracting a search condition by

quantifying limitations in the attribute information and further quantifying priorities of the

desired conditions.

Janssen discloses a search method which compares a buyer's desired attribute

information with a property database. Then the method performs analysis which ranks,

quantifies, and sorts the properties in the property database per the buyer's attributes.

Finally the method returns to the buyer a list of properties which is ranked to how closely

the property matches the buyer's desired attributes. Jannsen at Figs. 5, 6a, 6b, 7a, 7b; cols.

6-8.

For example, the method assigns points to certain buyer specified attributes or

features and uses. The points are used to find exact matches and close matches. Janssen at

col. 6, lines 18-30.

17.   Regarding Claim 5, "Janssen" discloses the following as claimed:

5. The estate group purchasing matching system according to claim 1, wherein the estate

purchase desirer general extraction means extracts general information of a plurality of estate

purchase desirers using the search condition setting means, and is capable of simulating possible

combination patterns.

Janssen discloses a method where a buyer enters general information concerning his

desired attribute information (desired features of housing buyer is looking for). This

information is entered into the system by the buyer and extracted by the system to be used

in the search method to find properties matching a buyer's attributes. See Figs. 5, 6a, 6b,

7a, 7b; cols. 6-8.

18.   Regarding Claim 6, "Janssen" discloses the following as claimed:

        6. The estate group purchasing matching system according to claim 1, further comprising:

desired condition analysis means for analyzing in detail the conditions of each of the plurality of

estate purchase general candidates extracted by the estate purchase desirer general extraction

means with respect to each property of the for-sale property information database to narrow

combinations.

        Janssen discloses a search method which sorts and ranks properties according to a

point system and buyer attributes. This search method narrows the pool of properties in

the property database to a reasonable number of properties ranked according to how

closely the properties match or nearly match buyer's attributes. See Figs. 5, 6a, 6b, 7a, 7b;

cols. 6-8.

19.   Regarding Claim 7, "Janssen" discloses the following as claimed:

        7. The estate group purchasing matching system according to claim 6, wherein with

respect to each property of the for-sale property information database, the property processing

means processes the property so that a designated candidate for-sale property is allocated to

match as much as possible with needs of a plurality of estate purchase candidates selected by the desired condition analysis means.

Janssen discloses a search method which sorts and ranks properties according to a point system and buyer attributes. This search method narrows the pool of properties in the property database to a reasonable number of properties ranked according to how closely the properties match or nearly match buyer's attributes. See Figs. 5, 6a, 6b, 7a, 7b; cols. 6-8.

20. Regarding Claim 8, "Janssen" discloses the following as claimed:

8. The estate group purchasing matching system according to claim 1, wherein the property processing means comprises customer information storage means for storing customer information including desired locations and desired prices,

Janssen provides a kiosk with a touch screen where a user/buyer may enter information such as claimed desired locations and desired prices. The kiosk contains a processor and data storage means for storing the information entered by the customer/user/buyer. See Janssen at Fig. 1 being the system and 'means for'; Fig. 3, elements 320 – desired location, 310 – desired price; column 4, lines 39-41 and column 6, lines 30-34.

customer extraction means for extracting customers whose desired location is a location of an offered property,

Janssen discloses a computer processor and property database. Sellers and brokers advertise their properties for sale via the disclosed kiosk and display. Customers enter their preferred attributes via the touch screen. The database stores both seller and customer information. The CPU/processor accesses the data entered and stored and retrieves properties witch match or nearly match a customer's attributes. Janssen at Fig. 2, element 250 - CPU, and Fig. 3, elm. 320 – location; column 4, lines 39-41.

pattern selection reference information acquiring means for acquiring pattern selection reference information based on a distribute of desired prices of extracted customers, parcel pattern selecting means for selecting a parcel pattern of the offered property based on the pattern selection reference information and the customer information,

Janssen provides a customer/buyer/user with the ability to enter a plurality of desired attributes or features into the disclosed system. Combined these features comprise the type, location, size, price of the property which the customer is shopping for. Examiner construes this process of customer entering desired attributes as the claimed pattern selection and parcel pattern selection. Janssen at Fig. 4, elements 300 – being the 'means for', and 310 – pattern selection reference, and 320 – extracted customers at desired price; Janssen at Fig. 6(b).

and means for providing information of parcel and price to the extracted customers based on the parcel pattern, the pattern selection reference information and the customer information.

Janssen provides several means for a customer to view properties which the kiosk/CPU has matched to customer desired attributes. At Fig. element 120 a display is disclosed; see also Janssen at Fig. 6(b), element 24. Further, at Fig. 2, element 260 a Printer is disclosed. Examiner construes the disclosed display monitor and printer as claimed means for providing information of parcel and price ...

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

21.   The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all

obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

> (a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in
> section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are
> such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person
> having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the
> manner in which the invention was made.

> The factual inquiries set forth in **Graham v. John Deere Co., 383 U.S. 1, 148 USPQ 459
> (1966)**, that are applied for establishing a background for determining obviousness under
> 35 U.S.C. 103(a) are summarized as follows: *(See MPEP Ch. 2141)*

>   a.   Determining the scope and contents of the prior art;
>   b.   Ascertaining the differences between the prior art and the claims in issue;
>   c.   Resolving the level of ordinary skill in the pertinent art; and
>   d.   Evaluating evidence of secondary considerations for indicating obviousness or
>   nonobviousness.

22.   Claim 3 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over "Janssen" as

applied to Claim 1 above and in further view of "Geranio, US PGPub. 2004/0002871 (Geranio)".

23.   Regarding Claim 3, "Janssen" discloses the following as claimed:

        3. The estate group purchasing matching system according to claim 1, wherein the

information of desired purchase conditions of estate purchase desirers databased by the estate

purchase desirer data input means includes at least information as to whether a desired property

is

        Tables A and Table B disclose many attributes about the stored property.

        information of desired railroad, information of desired station,

        Table A discloses as one attribute the distance to public transportation.

information of desired price of a property, and

Table A discloses location and price information.

Janssen does not disclose the following:

a land or a house with the land,

personal attribute information of desirers, and

the attribute information on the estate purchase desirers includes at least a name, an age, a

current address, a telephone number, an e-mail address, a family structure, occupation, place of

work and years of continuous employment, annual income, presence or absence of initial deposit,

motive of desire for purchase and whether the current house is an own house or not.

However, Geranio does. Geranio like Janssen disclose a property database and

search method which allows sellers and brokers to market properties to buyers. Geranio at

Abstract.

Geranio also discloses having buyers enter personal financial and contact

information. Geranio at [0031, 0033-0034].

Geranio further discloses having a buyer enter preferred attribute or criteria

information into a Buyer's Database. The information entered reflective of the type,

location, price, size, etc… of property which the buyer is looking for. Fig. 1 and [0028-

0029].

It would be obvious to one of ordinary skill to look to Geranio to solve the claimed

features not disclosed by Janssen. Further, one would expect a reasonable chance of

success when combining the references as both references seek to solve the same problem of matching buyers and sellers of real estate and both set out to solve the problem by employing the use of a computer coupled to a database which employs a search method which matches a buyers preferences to stored properties.

Although not expressly disclosed by Janssen it would be obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to collect personal information about a prospective buyer or renter. This information is normally collected in writing when a buyer or renter is applying for a loan or filling out an application to rent. This personal finance and contact information is also generally collected by a broker when establishing a broker/buyer or broker/seller relationship. Thus, it would be obvious to have the machine or systems disclosed by Jansen collect this information as well.

Motivation to combine may be gleaned from the prior art contemplated. Therefore, one skilled in the art would have found it obvious from the combined teachings of "Janssen" and "Geranio" as a whole to produce the invention as claimed with a reasonable expectation of achieving: the personal attribute information claimed above.

24.   Claim 9 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over "Janssen" as applied to Claim 8 above and in further view of "Walker et al. US 6,466,919 (Walker)".

25.   Regarding Claim 9, *Janssen does not expressly disclose*:

9. The estate group purchasing matching system according to claim 8, wherein the pattern

selection reference information includes information as to whether desired prices of the extracted

customers are centered on a particular price.

Regarding claim 9 being the real estate trading system according to claim 8, Walker

discloses what Janssen does not. Specifically, the pattern selection reference information

includes information on whether or not desired prices of the extracted customers are

concentrated on a particular price (Fig. 2, elements 500/700/800/900, and Fig 7, e.g. line

705, and column 3, lines 17-24). Walker discloses a similar system and method by which it

may be determined whether a price is within certain predefined tolerances. This is

applicable to the present invention where a customer defines his price range or price

tolerance and the system returns properties meeting his desired attributes which are within

(or centered) those customer defined tolerances.

It would be obvious of one of ordinary skill in the art of market research for land

development, to draw on the available methodology and technology to not only simplify the

research, but yield more reliable demand valuations to match supply. This is the effect of

combining the disclosures of Janssen and Walker.

Motivation to combine may be gleaned from the prior art contemplated. Therefore,

one skilled in the art would have found it obvious from the combined teachings of

"Janssen" and "Walker" as a whole to produce the invention as claimed with a reasonable

expectation of achieving: the pattern selection reference information includes information

as to whether desired prices of the extracted customers are centered on a particular price.

26.   Claims 10-11 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over "Janssen"

as applied to Claim 9 above and in further view of "Walker".

27.   Regarding Claim 10, *Janssen does not expressly disclose*:

        10. The estate group purchasing matching system according to claim 9, wherein when the

desired prices of the extracted customers are centered on a particular price, the parcel pattern

selecting means selects a parcel pattern with equally divided parcels.

        Regarding claim 10 being the real estate trading system according to claim 9,

Walker discloses wherein when the desired prices of the extracted customers are

concentrated on the particular price, the all individuals are parceled the same quality and

quantity product (Fig. 9,elm. 945 -price, and elm 960- Quantity of individuals in aggregate

all receiving elm. 955-conditions).

        Motivation to combine may be gleaned from the prior art contemplated. Therefore,

one skilled in the art would have found it obvious from the combined teachings of

"Janssen" and "Walker" as a whole to produce the invention as claimed with a reasonable

expectation of achieving: when the desired prices of the extracted customers are centered

on a particular price, the parcel pattern selecting means selects a parcel pattern with

equally divided parcels.

28.   Regarding Claim 11,

11. The estate group purchasing matching system according to claim 9, wherein when the desired prices of the extracted customers are not centered on a particular price, the pattern selection reference information acquiring means performs grading corresponding to the desired prices of the extracted customers, and the parcel pattern selecting means selects a parcel pattern in consideration of the grading.

Regarding claim 11 being the real estate trading system according to claim 9, Janssen discloses wherein when the desired prices of the extracted customers are not concentrated on the particular price, the pattern selection reference information acquiring means performs grading corresponding to the desired prices of the extracted customers, and the parcel pattern selecting means selects a parcel pattern in consideration of the grading. Janssen at Abstract - Mid -paragraph, reading 'In contrast...", and Fig. 7(a)).

29.   Claims 12-15 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over "Janssen" as applied to Claim 8 above and in further view of "Look et al. US PGPub. 2004/0225968 (Look)".

30.   Regarding Claims 12-15,

12. The estate group purchasing matching system according to claim 8, wherein the offered property is trimmed in the shape of a rectangle.

13. The estate group purchasing matching system according to claim 8, wherein 3-D house images are displayed in parcels of the offered property.

14. The estate group purchasing matching system according to claim 8, wherein a property line of parcels of the offered property is changed based on the pattern selection reference information and the customer information.

15. The estate group purchasing matching system according to claim 8, wherein 3-D house images are displayed in parcels of the offered property, a property line of parcels of the offered property is changed based on the pattern selection reference information and the customer information, and display of the 3-D images change according to the change in the property line.

Regarding claims 12-15, Janssen teaches Applicant's claimed system as recited in claim 8 with subsequent dependencies. However, *Janssen does not teach*:

12. … wherein the offered property is trimmed in the shape of a rectangle.

13. … wherein 3-D house images are displayed in parcels of the offered property.

14. … wherein a property line of parcels of the offered property is changed based on the pattern selection reference information and the customer information.

15. … wherein 3-D house images are displayed in parcels of the offered property, a property line of parcels of the offered property is changed based on the pattern selection reference information and the customer information, and display of the 3-D images change according to the change in the property line.

However, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art, to modify

Janssen to have any kind of shape or pattern in order to accommodate a customer's needs

(In re Dailey, 357 F.2d 669, 149 USPQ 47 (CCPA 1966)).

Further, Janssen does disclose displaying images and storing images. See col. 4,

lines 17-32. Although he doesn't expressly disclose displaying 3-D images of houses it

would be obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art that a system which is designed to

advertise and sell real estate and one which has the ability to store and display images

could also store and display a 3-D image of a house.

Janssen does not expressly disclose changing property lines. However, Look does.

There are many references which teach the well known art of Computer Aides Drafting

(CAD). CAD systems are old and well known in the art. Look discloses such a system

which is available on a network and which would easily be able to perform the features

claimed. See Look at Abstract and at Summary of the Invention.

It would be obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to look to the state of the art

CAD system then available to perform the relatively simple drawing features claimed by

applicant. Further, one would anticipate a high level of success as both Janssen and Look

are designed to work on a computer network and both deal with buildings and property

(Janssen sells and matches property while Look renders drawings of property).

Motivation to combine may be gleaned from the prior art contemplated. Therefore,

one skilled in the art would have found it obvious from the combined teachings of

"Janssen" and "Look" as a whole to produce the invention as claimed with a reasonable

expectation of achieving: a property line of parcels of the offered property is changed based on the pattern selection reference information and the customer information.

Conclusion

31.   The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure.

- Flanders US 6,688,052

- Thomson US 4,642,780

- Apgar, US 5,680,305

- Wiese, US 6,323,885

Contact Information

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to MATTHEW T. SITTNER whose telephone number is (571) 270-7137. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday-Friday, 8:00am - 5:00pm.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, John Weiss can be reached on (571) 272-6812. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

/MATTHEW T SITTNER/
Examiner, Art Unit 3629

/John G. Weiss/
Supervisory Patent Examiner, Art Unit 3629